

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending as of the action mailed 26 March 2007.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-11, 16, 17 and 19 are being amended; claims 4, 5, 7, 12-15, 18 and 20 have been cancelled and no new claims have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to claims 1-3, 6, 8-11, 16, 17 and 19 may be found within the applicant's specification at least within paragraphs 0024-0026, 0030, 0037 and 0038, in addition to Fig. 3.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,515,531 ("Fujiwara") in view of U.S. Patent 4,914,569 ("Levine").

Claims 1, 8 and 16

To expedite prosecution, and without prejudice, claims 1, 8 and 16 have been amended to recite features not found within the combination of Fujiwara and Levine. Specifically, claims 1, 8 and 16 have been amended to better clarify the association of non-unique record keys with database keys to uniquely identify records in a database. A database key uniquely identifies a record in a database. A non-unique record key does not have sufficient information to uniquely identify a record in a database. Using the database key association layer, the non-unique record keys are associated with database keys corresponding to records in the database. Thus, the association of a non-unique record key with a database key uniquely identifies a record in a database.

Remaining Claims

The remaining claims depend from or correspond to independent claims 1, 8 and 16, and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Levine. Claims 13-15 have been cancelled.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 25 June 2007

/Arrienne M. Lezak/

Arrienne M. Lezak

Reg. No. 51,943

Customer No. **32864**

Fish & Richardson P.C.

Telephone: (650) 839-5070

Facsimile: (650) 839-5071